

AMENDMENT OF DRAWINGS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.85, applicants submit herewith a Replacement Sheet 8/8 for this application. In the Replacement Sheet, Figures 13 and 14 are amended to include reference numerals to indicate features shown in the drawings as originally filed. No new matter is involved in the amendment of the drawings.

REMARKS

The amendments to the drawings and the specification are identical to the amendments submitted in the previous Amendment and Response filed on January 13, 2006.

Applicants have amended the drawings to add reference numerals to indicate features shown in the drawings as originally filed. In Figs. 13 and 14, reference numeral "140" is added to designate the top surface 140 of the pivot bar 138. The reference numerals "142" and "144" are added to designate the brush base 142 and the top surface 144 of the brush base 142. No new matter is involved in the amendments of the drawings.

RESPONSE TO OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicants have amended the specification to overcome the Examiner's objection.

The specification has been amended to provide antecedent basis for the limitation of Claim 1 that "the surfaces of the first and second bristle supports being capable of lying in substantially a same plane during operation of the electric toothbrush." The original specification discloses a brush base (now designated 142) which corresponds to the first bristle support and a pivot bar 138 which corresponds to the second bristle support of Claim 1. The original drawings (Figs. 13 and 14) show that the pivot bar 138 and the brush base 142 have top surfaces (now designated as 140 and 144) which are capable of lying in substantially the same plane. This occurs during the operation of the electric toothbrush when the pivot bar 138 is aligned with the brush base 142 by oscillation of the pivot bar 138 relative to the brush base 142.

Applicants believe that the above amendments provide the required antecedent basis for the limitation recited in Claim 1 and that no new matter is involved. Accordingly, applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In the Official Action of November 14, 2005, Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 were allowed. Applicants believe that the amendments of the specification submitted herewith provide the antecedent basis for the terms used in the claims. Claims 8-12 which were copied from U.S. Patent 6,889,401 for purposes of an interference are now cancelled. Accordingly, applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that any outstanding matters can be resolved by a telephone discussion, applicants suggest that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles P. Boukus, Jr.
Registration No. 24,754
Attorney for Applicants
Suite 202
2001 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202
(703) 415-2620

March 13, 2006